

sense of urgency because of the confusion regarding the taxation of farmland in the disputed areas. In some cases, farmers are receiving tax notices from both Nebraska and Missouri. With the agricultural community facing such difficult economic times, the last thing a farmer needs is to pay taxes twice on the same land.

In addition to taxation concerns, there are also jurisdictional problems related to law enforcement and the delivery of services. It is currently possible, for example, that because of jurisdictional uncertainties, an individual could escape punishment if a crime is committed in the disputed areas. Clearly, these are serious problems that would be resolved by this legislation.

In certain cases, costly litigation is needed to determine the true and correct boundary line. In some instances, a Missouri court may determine that the land should be located in Missouri, while a Nebraska court will find that the same land belongs to Nebraska. It is in the best interests of both states, as well as those landowners affected by this uncertainty, to have these disputes handled in a formal manner which makes sense. The compact is intended to do just that.

Ms. DANNER. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GEKAS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume only to add a note to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that in this and many other issues that come before our committee our legal staff, Ray Smitanka and Jim Harper, Susan Conklin, and others have helped immensely from beginning to end. I want, in his absence, to also commend Demetrios Kouzoukas, who acted as and was an intern in our office and worked specifically on this piece of legislation, and I want the record to indicate our gratitude to him for his efforts there.

I urge support and passage of this legislation.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 54.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSENT OF CONGRESS TO BOUNDARY CHANGE BETWEEN GEORGIA AND SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. GEKAS. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 62) to grant the consent of Congress to the boundary change between Georgia and South Carolina.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.J. RES. 62

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. CONSENT OF CONGRESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The consent of Congress is given to the establishment of the boundary between the States of Georgia and South Carolina.

(b) NEW BOUNDARY.—The boundary referred to in subsection (a) is the boundary—

(1) agreed to by the State of Georgia in Act Number 1044 (S.B. No. 572) approved by the Governor on April 5, 1994, and agreed to by the State of South Carolina in Act Number 375 (S.B. No. 1315) approved by the Governor on May 29, 1996;

(2) agreed to by the State of Georgia in Act Number 1044 (S.B. No. 572) approved by the Governor on April 5, 1994, and agreed to by the State of South Carolina in an Act approved by its Governor not later than 5 years after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution;

(3) agreed to by the State of South Carolina in Act Number 375 (S.B. No. 1315) approved by the Governor on May 29, 1996, and agreed to by the State of Georgia in an Act approved by its Governor not later than 5 years after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution; or

(4) agreed to by the States of Georgia and South Carolina in Acts approved by each of their Governors not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this joint resolution.

(c) COMPACT.—The Acts referred to in subsection (b) are recognized by Congress as an interstate compact pursuant to section 10 of article I of the United States Constitution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) and the gentlewoman from Missouri (Ms. DANNER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GEKAS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.J. Res. 62.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEKAS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Just as in the previous matter, we are given the duty and responsibility now of giving our stamp of approval to the States of Georgia and South Carolina to an agreement that they have reached relative to a boundary problem that has existed for a long time between those two States. This goes back, as I understand it, historically to the Beaufort Convention of 1787, even before the Constitution as we now know it came into existence.

But, in any event, whatever the nature of those disputes were, we have come to a point now where, in seeking the approval of the Congress, those two States are conforming to the constitutional process and we find no impediment at all in granting consent by the Congress to those two States for the proposition which they have brought to us.

More fully will be discussed, I am certain, this whole set of cir-

cumstances by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER).

Ms. DANNER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.J. Res. 62. With this legislation, we fulfill our constitutional obligation to review and grant our consent to compacts between States.

I will not belabor the details of this matter. They will be more fully stated by my colleague from Georgia.

The States of Georgia and South Carolina have worked out their border dispute to their mutual satisfaction, and it deserves our support.

The bill was reported by the Committee on the Judiciary by unanimous consent, and I am aware of no opposition.

I urge the adoption of this measure.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GEKAS. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he might consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER).

Mr. LINDER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to speak to my colleagues on House Joint Resolution 62, a resolution to ratify an interstate compact that corrects a long-standing border dispute between the States of Georgia and South Carolina.

It is not every day that Congress deals with borders between States. Sometimes it seems that borders are some of the only constants in the changing social and political landscape of America.

Nevertheless, Georgia and South Carolina come to Congress today to settle a dispute that has gone as high as the United States Supreme Court concerning their common border where the Savannah River meets the sea.

The issue at hand is essentially a product of time and geography. The original line between the States was set in 1787 at the Beaufort Convention. Much of the interior of the two States had not been surveyed, and officials had not even dreamed of the precise coordinate systems of today.

Therefore, the delegates to the Convention used the natural landmarks they have available and set the boundary as the northern branch of the Savannah River, reserving all islands to Georgia. This line has stood in question for 140 years until 1922, when the Supreme Court clarified the line in a case between Georgia and South Carolina involving the stage of the river that should be used to determine the boundary.

In this decision, the Court stated that where there were islands in the Savannah River, the boundary would fall at the midpoint between the island's bank and the South Carolina bank at normal stage. Where there

were no islands, the border would fall at the midpoint between the two banks at normal stage.

In the years following this decision, the obvious question arose concerning whether islands that had formed since the Beaufort Convention automatically belong to Georgia or to the State in whose territory the islands would have fallen at the time of the Convention.

Dredging performed by the Army Corps of Engineers in the Savannah River and additional questions involving the mouth of the river further complicated the border dispute.

The expansion of the Port of Savannah and the economic interests in the region began to be disrupted by the confusion.

□ 1630

Finally, Madam Speaker, in 1990 the Supreme Court decided the issue by assigning the particular set of islands in dispute, the Barnwell Islands, to South Carolina. Further, the Court found that the Beaufort Convention did not control the islands formed in the river since its ratification. The Court directed the States to draw up new boundary agreements based on these principles. The two States have worked with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, using the best mapping and surveying equipment available to set a boundary that is in keeping with the Court's findings.

It is this new agreement that we bring before the House today. H.J. Res. 62 ratifies the boundary agreed upon by both States and codified into law by both State legislatures. The line runs roughly along the center of Savannah River and incorporates the findings of the Supreme Court in its latest decision. I understand that there are some discrepancies between the authorizing bills from the two States, but I believe that this resolution will allow Congress to approve the agreement while giving the States the flexibility to make any final corrections that may be necessary.

I would like to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) for his hard work on this legislation and the gentlewoman from Missouri (Ms. DANNER). This joint resolution satisfies the Constitution's requirement that Congress ratify all interstate compacts. I hope that the House will look favorably on our States' efforts to legally clarify our borders using today's sophisticated mapping technology, and I appreciate this opportunity to address the Nation that uniquely affects the people of my State.

Ms. DANNER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In closing, I would like to add my personal appreciation, vote of thanks, to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS). As my colleagues know, a number of people are not involved, and

this legislation is perhaps not terribly important to great numbers of people, millions of people, but to those people to whom this does apply this is a very important piece of legislation, and I want to express publicly my appreciation to the chairman of the committee for all he has done to bring this bill forward in such a timely manner; and we are deeply appreciative, and we thank you so much.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GEKAS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume only to allow the RECORD to reflect that we also appreciate the efforts of the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), the ranking minority member on our committee, who helped to shepherd this whole issue to both the hearing stage in our subcommittee and to the point where we now seek the final approval of the Congress of the compact in question, and also to David Lachman and to other staff members, some of whom are better known than others to us, but nevertheless to whom we are all grateful.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 62.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2084, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2084) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LINDER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. SABO

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SABO moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill, H.R. 2084, be instructed to provide maximum funding, within the scope of conference, for the functions and operations of the Office of Motor Carriers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) each will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO).

(Mr. SABO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this motion is very straightforward. The House bill includes \$70.484 million for the functions and operations of the Office of Motor Carriers. Senate bill provides \$57.418 million, and this motion to instruct simply instructs the House conferees to provide the maximum amount possible for motor carrier safety operations.

Mr. Speaker, I want to particularly commend the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), the chair of the subcommittee, for his ongoing effort to make sure that we maximize our ability to monitor and inspect and make sure we have the safest motor vehicle safety program in this country and in particular his focus on drug safety, and I commend his leadership, and I just think we should follow his leadership and provide the funding that is provided in the House bill.

Mr. Speaker, this Motion to Instruct is very straightforward. The House bill includes \$70.484 million for the functions and operations of the Office of Motor Carriers. The Senate bill provides \$57.418 million. This Motion to Instruct simply instructs the House conferees to provide the maximum amount possible for motor carrier safety operations.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. WOLF, for his efforts over the past two years in shining a bright light on the serious deficiencies in the Department of Transportation's oversight of truck safety. Nearly every driving American has had the unpleasant experience of looking in his or her rear view mirror at a very large truck speeding down the highway.

Nearly 5,400 deaths occurred from large truck accidents in 1997—the most recent year available. This is the equivalent of a major airline crash with 200 fatalities every 2 weeks. And, regardless of the cause of these accidents, it is nearly always the occupant in the car involved that loses.

One out of every four large trucks that get inspected each year are so unsafe that they are pulled off the roads. That is the safety record of those trucks that are inspected—a large number are never even inspected.

Over 6,000 motor carriers received a less than satisfactory safety rating between 1995 and 1998 and many of these carriers continue to operate.

The number of compliance reviews OMC performed has declined by 30% since FY 1995, even though there has been a 36% increase in the number of motor carriers over this period. Nearly 250 high-risk carriers recommended for a compliance review in March 1998 did not receive one.